prevention of replacement of the internal marking indicia by different markings.

REMARKS

The claims have been amended in view of the Office action and in view of the remarks which follow, they are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The Office Action stated as follows:

"The newly added limitation that the non-black optically transmissive material cannot be scraped off the chip for prevention of replacement of the internal marking indicia by different markings is not adequately described in the specification/claims. The examiner is unclear on how a material applied to a chip cannot be scraped off, and the examiner cannot find enabling support for such a material in the disclosure/claims.

The specification and the claims have been amended to overcome the above ground of rejection. The application makes it clear that the purpose of the material added to the workpiece is integral therewith and the application specifically mentions at page 4, lines 1-4 application formation of the protection layer can be performed by molding, printing, dispensing and glob top, etc. A glob top dispenses the encapsulation (emphasis added) material such as an epoxy material (emphasis added) which makes it clear that the layer is bonded to the workpiece. The description of the epoxy material with which those skilled in the art are familiar makes it clear that the material is not for example a removable label, a conventional easily removable coating such as a conventional paint, or varnish or the like.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re independent claims 1,9, 12,13,22, and 25, these claims recite the newly added limitation

that the non-black optically transmissive material cannot be scraped off the chip for prevention of replacement of the internal marking indicia by different markings. This newly added limitation renders the claim vague/indefinite since it is unclear how any material cannot be scraped off a surface if enough force is applied.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action claims 1-10, 12-23, and 25 were are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The Office Action stated as follows:

"The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the relationship between the non-black optically transmissive material, and the exterior of the chip. It is unclear to the examiner how the optically transmissive material can be formed on the chip and yet be irremovable off the surface via scraping. The relationship between the material and chip surface is unclear, as it appears that a material could be removed via scraping, even if it causes damage to the chip, since applicant does not claim that the contrary."

The amendments to the claims are believed to overcome the listed grounds of rejection because it is believed it is made clear that the coating formed on the workpiece is bonded thereto as epoxy materials are bonded to workpieces.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

In paragraph 5, claims 11 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rostoker (US 5,644,102). The Office Actions stated as follows:

"Rostoker teaches a method of marking a chip forming a non-black, colored material layer over at least an exterior surface of the chip wherein the color identifies the chip, through FIG.'s 3A-4B and " A technique is described for providing body coloration and colored indicia for indicating one or more characteristics of an integrated circuit device. Package body coloration is one source of information about device characteristics. Other indications relate to colored indicia. The colored indicia are relatively large and easily viewable from distances too great for printed text on the package body to be read comfortably (see FIG. 3A (6, 320a, 320b, 340) and FIG. 6A). The indicia is (are) colored (FIG. 2A 234a and 236a) other than black or white. Among the visible indicia characteristics which can be used to convey information are: indicia color (or colors on multi-colored indicia), shape, size, orientation, and/or location. Among the various integrated circuit device characteristics which can be conveyed by the indicia characteristics are: device function, device speed, level of testing, degree of rad-hardness, location of reference pin, side, corner or surface, location and function of groups of pins carrying related signals, etc. In order to facilitate assembly, colored indicia matching those on the integrated circuit devices can be printed on a printed circuit board substrate at locations and in orientations on the printed circuit corresponding to the correct assembled positions of the integrated circuit devices (FIG. 6A, 632b and 620b). C lored areas can also b incorporat d into semiconductor packages to control (alter, m dify) the thermal charact ristics of the package, particularly in order that thermal stresses n a die operating within th package can be reduced and equalized" (abstract). This is interpreted to include a non-black colored material

layer over a surface of the chip to identify th chip."

In view of the amendments to the claims it is believed to be clear that the feature of providing a cover layer which is irremovable from the surface of the chip, with the cover layer covering the indicia marked on the chip is not in any way suggested by the Rostoker patent so the rejection is now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 6, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shamir (US 5,118,369) in view of Rostoker (US 5,644, 102)], Samonides (US 5,346, 738) and Hess, Jr. et al. (US 5,279,690). The Office Action stated as follows:

"Shamir teaches a method for marking a chip by forming marking indicia on a marking location upon an exterior surface of the chip for identification of the chip through FIG. 8 and '*the microlabels 122 may be utilized in any application in which product identification requires exceedingly small labels. Moreover, microlabels bearing other indicia such as letter or numerals, either with or without bar codes, offers IC manufacturers and others a unique microlabelling capability (see FIG 8, label 122 and FIG. 9 labels 128 and 130*' (abstract). Though Shamir do sn't teach that the labels are on chips, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to include such labels on chips, since Shamir is teaching microlables for small IC applications, such as circuits on wafers, and it would have been obvious to extend this to chips or other similar IC devices."

"Shamir fails to teach that the indicia is internal."

Thus it is believed to be clear that the feature of providing a cover layer which is not easily removable from the surface of the chip, with the cover layer covering the indicia marked on the chip is not in any way suggested by the Shamir patent.

Next, the Office Action stated as follows:

"Further, Rostoker teaches that indicia on marking locations on an exterior surface of the chip for identification exist through FIG's 2 and 3A-3B."

"Rostoker fails to teach that the indicia is internal."

Thus it is believed to be clear that the feature of providing a cover layer which is not easily removable from the surface of the chip, with the cover layer covering the indicia marked on the chip is not in any way suggested by the Rostoker patent. Next, the Office Action stated as follows

"Samonides teaches that the indicia is internal through '*An identification label for permanently marking a metal or other etchable surface such as an automobile part with an identifying indicia is disclosed. The label has a protective cover sheet 14, a pressure sensitive adhesive 34 irremovably affixed to the cover sheet, and a liner with a release c ating removably*

affixed to the adhesive. An identifying indicia 44 comprising an etchant in a visible vehicle such as a printing ink is printed on the adhesive at the interface f the rem vable liner and the adhesive so that when the liner is rem ved, the remaining p rtions f the label may be adhesively attached to the metal surface with the etchant of the identifying indicia in etching contact therewith. The identifying indicia will thus be etched into the surface of the part for a permanent marking of the part' (abstract)." "Though Samonides doesn't teach that the label is specifically for a chip or IC device, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use such a technique for chip identification since Samonides teaches that it can be used for marking a metal or other etchable, relatively small, surface. Further, it is well known that semiconductors and IC components commonly are etched, further obviating such modification to the teachings of Samonides."

"Samonides fails to teach forming a non-black optically transmissive material over at least the marking location on the one exterior surface of the chip, that it is transparent or semi-transparent. Further, Samonides fails to teach that the material is used for environmental handling and protection."

The Samonides reference is not directed to applying a permanent cover sheet which is not easily removable from the surface of the work piece. Instead, Samonides has a cover sheet 14 which is irremovable from the adhesive layer 34. There is no indication that the adhesive layer 34 is not easily removable from the work piece. Since a permanently etched set of indicia are formed in the surface of the work piece, the adhesive layer 34 is simply indicative of the pattern of the etching solution in the first (etching) indicia printed on the inner surface of the adhesive layer 34. Most importantly Samonides relates to etching of indicia into a metal surface and the label is temporary as explained at Col. 6, line 53, quoted as follows:

"It will be apparent that the etching of the indicia onto the metal surface may be accomplished without the label indicia 24 and without the clear film or cover sheet 14 *because these are only a means for identifying the indicia 44 which will be etched into the metal surface*. If desired, the cover sheet may merely be a printed paper cover sheet with the label indicia printed on the exterior surface of this paper cover sheet. A much more finished appearance, however, is achieved with the smooth thermoplastic protective film or cover sheet 14 through which the label indicia 24 is visible. Since the etching indicia 44 is carried in an ink vehicle, this may be rendered visible through the composite label if both the adhesive layer 34 and the film or cover sheet 14 are transparent. In the preferred embodiment, the adhesive is opaque and forms the background for the indicia 24." [Emphasis added]

Thus it is believed to be clear that the feature of providing a cover layer covering the indicia marked on the chip with the cover layer being difficult to remove from the surface of the chip is not in any way suggested by the Samonides patent.

Next, the Office Action stated as follows:

"Hess, Jr. et al. t aches such a material thr ugh FIG. 10 and 'th label will have maximum lif since the bar code or like indicia is protected by Mylar material' (col 4, lines 27+) and transpar nt protective material 11. Hess, Jr. et al. teaches the transmissive material is used for environmental protection and handling of the devices through *'a label construction provides for labels applied to a surface that have long life even outdoors, or in conditions where there are dirt or chemicals'* (abstract) and *'According to the present invention a label construction, and method of production of labels, are provided which greatly enhance label life, in a simple manner'* (col 1, lines 27+)."
"Further, claim 3 is not given patentable weight, as it's a use claim.

Hess is believed to be from the non-analogous art of business forms. There is no suggestion in Hess that the film provided is not easily removable. Those who use Moore business forms know that they are for Office Use and that they can be removed as can postage stamps with weak adhesive backing. They are not intended to difficult to remove and in fact they fall off after time. Accordingly the reference is believed to be suitable for withdrawal from further consideration because it has nothing to do with prevention of fraud and the manufacture of industrial products such as chips and even automobile parts which require permanent marking to prevent fraud and theft. In addition, claim 3 has been amended to overcome the use claim argument.

The Office Action stated further as follows:

"Re claims 4 and 8, at the time the invention was made, it was well known in the art that conventional bar codes are read by bar code systems directing electromagnetic radiation on the marking indicia (barcode) and processing the received reflected radiation/images, that such reading can take place even when the indicia is behind a transparent layer, such as the case in grocery stores, etc."
"Re claim 5, though Shamir fails to teach a non-black optically transmissive colored material covers at least the marking location of the one exterior surface of the chip, Shamir teaches" *'a color bar encoded microlabel, small enough to be placed on the surface of the die' "(Abstract) and 'The microlabels, whether color bar or black/white coded, are applied preferably at the wafer probing stage'* (abstract). This is interpreted to include color bar codes on chips and other semiconductor devices."
"Further, though Hess, Jr. et al. teaches a transparent covering/mylar above, Hess, Jr. t al. is silent to the specifics of the color."
"However, at the time the invention was made, it was well known that transparent/semi-transparent mylar could come in a variety of colors. Further, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to use a colored mylar. One would have been motivated to do this as a matter of design variation, since the applicant has not disclosed that a colored covering material solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose, and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a colored/black and white bar code as taught by Shamir, in combination with the transparent covering of Hess, Jr. et al."
"Re claim 6 and 7, since H ss, Jr. t al. teaches a cover over the indicia, and Shamir teaches labeling on IC dies on wafers, this is interpreted to include pr venting r marking indicia

or identification marks on the chip/ ilicon f r a semic nductor package, especially since silicon is well known as a semiconductor and is commonly found in wafer forms. Further, the etched or microlabels are on the device themselves, thus preventing remarking since they are not easily alterable."

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Shamir, Rostoker, Samonides, and Hess, Jr. et al.

"One would have been motivated to do this to provide a reliable, and robust way of identifying chips/semiconductor components by adding a cover to preserve the physical indicia and its genuineness, while still being able to read and identify the chip/indicia using conventional methods through the protective material layer."

As to the above arguments, the parent claims are believed to be patentable and the additional features in combination are believed to enhance the degree of patentability of the combinations claimed.

In paragraph 7, claims 9, 12,13-17, 19-22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker in view of Samonides and Hess, Jr. et al. The Office Action stated as follows:

"Rostoker teaches a semiconductor, integrated circuit chip having surfaces including a planar front surface, a planar back surface and edges of the chip between the planar surfaces with at least on electrical contact site on a surface tl1lough FIG 2 and FIG. 6. Rostoker teaches marking indicia 320a, 320b and 632b upon an exterior marking portion of a surface of the chip for identifying the chip through Figs. 3A-3B, and 6A."

"However, Rostoker fails to teach that the indicia is internal, forming a non-black layer covering the exterior surface of the chip at least at the exterior marking portion thereof, the non-black layer being composed, of a colored, optically transmissive, transparent material preventing remarking, whereby the indicia are visible through the non-black layer."

"Samonides teaches that the indicia is internal through 'An identification label for permanently marking a metal or other etchable surface such as an automobile part with an identifying indicia is disclosed. The label has a protective cover sheet 14, a pressure sensitive adhesive 34 irremovably affixed to the cover sheet, and a liner with a release coating removably affixed to the adhesive. An identifying indicia 44 comprising an etchant in a visible vehicle such as a printing ink is printed on the adhesive at the interface of the removable liner and the adhesive so that when the liner is removed, the remaining portions of the label may be adhesively attached to the metal surface with the etchant of the identifying indicia in etching contact therewith. The identifying indicia will thus be etched into the surface of the part for a permanent marking of the part" (abstract). Th ugh Samonides doesn't teach that the label is specifically for a chip or IC device, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to use such a technique for chip identification since Samonides teaches that it can be used for marking a metal r other etchable, relatively small, surface. Further, it is well known that semiconductors and IC components commonly are etched, further obviating such modification to the teachings of Samonides."

"Samonides fail to teach forming a non-black layer cov ring th xterior surfac of the chip at least at the xterior marking portion thereof, the non-black layer being compos d, of a colored, ptically transmissive, transparent material preventing remarking the indicia on the exterior marking surfac of the chip, whereby the indicia are visible through the non-black

layer. Samonides als fails to teach that the optically transmissive material is used for environmental protection/handling of the silicon."

"Hess, Jr. et al. teaches such a material through FIG. 10 and "*the label will have maximum life since the bar code or like indicia is protected by Mylar material*" (col 4, lines 27+) and transparent protective material 11. This is interpreted to include a non-black layer covering the exterior surface of the chip at least at the exterior marking position thereof. Though Hess, Jr. fails to teach the use of the cover on an internal barcode or indicia to identify a chip, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to apply a protective label to the indicia on the chip to cover the marking point of the label, to protect the indicia and prevent it from being tampered with or damaged, thus preventing remarking of the indicia since it is covered, and also increasing the indicia life and accuracy. Further, since the transparent protective material 11 is transparent, the indicia are visible through the layer. Though the specifics as to the color of the optically transmissive transparent cover are not disclosed, at the time the invention was made, it was well known that transparent/semi-transparent mylar could come in a variety of colors, and to use a colored mylar. One would have been motivated to do this as a matter of design choice, sine the applicant has not disclosed that a colored covering material solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose, and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with conventional transparent mylar. Re claim 19, Hess, Jr. et al. teaches a material for environmental handling/protection through FIG. 10 and '*the label will have maximum life since the bar code or like indicia is protected by Mylar material*' (col 4, lines 27+) and transparent protective material 11. Hess, Jr. et al. teaches the transmissive material is used for environmental protection and handling of the devices through '*a label construction provides for labels applied to a surface that have long life even outdoors, or in conditions where there are dirt or chemicals' (abstract) and 'According to the present invention a label construction, and method of production of labels, are provided which greatly enhance label life, in a simple manner*' (col 1, lines 27+). Further, claim 3 is not given patentable weight, as it's a use claim."

"Re claim 12, Rostoker teaches the color represents identification of the chip as discussed above in claim 11, and Shamir teaches marking indicia for identification. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to have color and indicia as means for identification. One would have been motivated to do this since Rostoker teaches that color is used to identify characteristics of the chip visible from far away such as pin location, etc., whereas the bar-coded indicia taught by Shamir could identify more in-depth data that would need to be encoded in bar code form. Thus the two different identification techniques allow different levels and amounts of data to be stored about the chip, thus being more convenient and user friendly for a user who needs to use, identify, or determining specific parameters of the chip."

"Re claim 17, it has been taught above that the transmissive material is transparent. Further, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art that the indicia taught by Rostoker or Samonides inherently prevent remarking since they are labels or etched indicia on the chip/device itself, and prevent remarking since they are not easily alterable."

"At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Rostoker, Samonides, and Hess, Jr. et al."

"One would have been motivated to do this to provide a reliable, and robust way of identifying chips/semiconductor comp nents by adding a cover t pres rve the physical internal indicia and its genuineness, while still being able to r ad and identify the chip/indicia using c nventional meth ds (barc d /col r identification), through the protective material layer."

As to the above arguments, the parent claims are believed to be patentable and the additional features in combination are believed to enhance the degree of patentability of the combinations claimed.

In paragraph 8, claims 10, 18, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker as modified by Samonides, and Hess, Jr. et al., and further in view of Shamir, as applied to claim 1. The Office Action stated as follows:

"The teachings of Rostoker as modified by Samonides and Hess, Jr. et al. have been discussed above."

"Rostoker as modified by Samonides and Hess, Jr. et al. fails to teach the internal indicia are read through the non-black optically tansmissive material in response to images of the internal marking indicia provided by reflections of the electromagnetic radiation directed upon the indicia."

"However, at the time the invention was made, it was well known in the art that conventional bar codes are read by directing electromagnetic radiation/illumination means on the marking indicia (barcode) and processing/reading the received reflected radiation/images, and that this reading process can take place through transparent layers, as in the case of grocery stores, etc."

"It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Rostoker as modified by Samonides, and Hess, Jr. et al., and further in view of Shamir, as applied to claim 1."

"One would have been motivated to do this to provide a reliable, and robust way of identifying chips/semiconductor components by adding a cover to preserve the physical internal indicia and its genuineness, while still being able to read and identify the chip/indicia using conventional methods, through the protective material layer."

As to the above arguments, the parent claims are believed to be patentable and the additional features in combination are believed to enhance the degree of patentability of the combinations claimed.

In paragraph 9 it was stated as a response to arguments that as follows:

"The examiner has considered the applicants arguments/amendment, but the arguments will not be considered until applicant overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections cited in the action."

The amendments to the claims are believed to have satisfied that condition precedent.

In paragraph 10 the Office Action stated as follows:

"The examiner notes that Further, th applicant has not specified a sp cific material or type of material for the 'optically transmissive material. . . for prevention of replacem nt. . . '. Thee selection f a known material based upon its suitability for the intended use is a d sign consideration within the skill of the art. In re Leshin, 227, F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA

1960). Further, with respect to the us of the mat rial, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987)."

It is respectfully submitted that the specification does mention specific materials which can be bonded to the workpiece such as epoxy. Clearly that is enough of a teaching since it is well known that there are permanent encapsulation materials which can be used to encapsulate workpieces. The point is that the indicia have not been buried in the encapsulated materials in the past.

In paragraph 11 the Office Action stated as follows:

"With respect to the applicants claim that the material cannot be scraped off, the examiner has found prior art teachings of resist covers (Chang et al. US 6,008,060), organic/inorganic/hermetic layers (Leroy et al. US 5,461,545), transparent insulators (Colla US 4,300,184), resin layers (Aoki et al. US 5,479,049) and plastic layers (Ohta et al. US 5,641,997), but the Examiner does not understand the limitation of a layer that cannot be scraped off, because it appears that any layer can be scraped off with enough pressure/time/force etc.

This ground of rejection is now believed to be moot in view of the amendments. Attached hereto are several pages including a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and the claims. The attached pages are captioned with "Version with markings to show changes made."

In view of the amendments and the above remarks favorable action including allowance of the claims and the application as a whole are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Graham S. Jones, II/Attorney
Reg. No. 20,429

Telephone (845) 473-9118 FAX (845) 485-9399

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE SPECIFICATION

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 3, line 16 to read as follows:

- -An object is to provide internal colored markings and/or indicia on packages which cannot be easily scraped off and replaced by different markings and/or indicia for purposes of relabeling or to cover up the original source of a product in cases of misappropriation of products. - -

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 12 line 12 to read as follows:

- - FIG. 33 shows an alternative type of marking in accordance with this invention. In this case the difference is that the package P2 comprising a flip-chip (face down) CH3 has internal marking indicia IM formed on the bottom surface (that is the active device surface) thereof. In this case the internal marking indicia IM are protected from damage or remarking since chip CH3 is covered, at least in part, by a non-black, protection layer PL3 between elements of the BGA balls BL. Protection layer PL3 is formed directly on the lower surface (as seen in FIG. 33) of the flip-chip CH3 and on top of the internal marking indicia IM. Some chips are sensitive to light. This embodiment protects the light sensitive surface of the flip-chip CH3 from exposure to light leakage since the uncovered surface is facing the lower packaging element (not shown) which will protect the light sensitive surface of flip-chip CH3 from light. A protection layer is formed over the internal colored markings and/or indicia and the chip. The protection layer is a clear, colored, tinted and transparent or translucent encapsulating material which cannot be easily scraped off . The formation of the protection layer can be performed by molding, printing, dispensing and glob top, etc. A glob top dispenses the encapsulation material such as an epoxy material bonded to the top of IC chips during packaging thereof. - -

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend the claims to read as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) A method of marking a chip having surfaces comprising the following steps:

forming internal marking indicia on a marking location upon an exterior surface of the chip for identification of the chip, and

forming a non-black, optically transmissive **encapsulating** material over at least the marking location on the one exterior surface of the chip which non-black, optically transmissive material cannot be **easily** scraped off of the chip for prevention of replacement of the internal marking indicia by different markings.

3. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the non-black, optically transmissive **encapsulating** material is **a protective encapsulating material** adapted to provide protection from damage as the result of environmental and handling factors.

6. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein the non-black, optically transmissive material **comprises a material such as epoxy which** prevents remarking indicia or identification marks on the chip.

12. (Twice Amended) A method of marking a chip having surfaces comprising:

forming internal marking indicia on a marking location upon an exterior surface of the chip, and

forming a non-black, optically transparent material colored with a particular color over at least the marking location on that exterior surface of the chip wherein the material colored with the particular color together with the marking indicia represents identification of the chip which non-black, optically transparent, colored material cannot be **easily** scraped off of the chip for prevention of replacement of the internal marking indicia by different markings.

13. (Twice Amended) A chip comprising:

the chip having exterior surfaces,

internal marking indicia formed on a marking location upon an exterior surface of the chip for identification of the chip, and

a non-black, optically transmissive material formed over at least the marking location on the one exterior surface of the chip which non-black, optically transmissive material cannot be easily scraped off for prevention of replacement of the internal marking indicia by different markings.

22. (Twice Amended) An electronic integrated circuit chip comprising:

a semiconductor, integrated circuit chip having surfaces including a planar front surface, a planar back surface and edges of the chip between the planar surfaces with at least one electrical contact site on a surface,

indicia marked upon an exterior marking portion of a surface of the chip for identification of the chip,

a non-black layer covering the exterior surface of the chip at least at the exterior marking portion thereof, the non-black layer being composed [,] of a colored, optically transmissive material which non-black, optically transmissive material cannot be easily scraped off of the chip for prevention of replacement of the indicia by different markings and for preventing remarking the indicia on the exterior marking surface of the chip, and

the indicia being visible through the non-black layer.

25. (Twice Amended) A chip comprising:

internal marking indicia formed on a marking location upon an exterior surface of the chip, and

a non-black, optically transparent material colored with a particular color formed over at least the marking location on that exterior surface of the chip wherein the material colored with the particular color together with the marking indicia represents identification of the chip which non-black, optically transmissive material cannot be easily scraped off of the chip for prevention of replacement of the internal marking indicia by different markings.